

Remarks

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the telephone conference between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney on January 3, 2008. In this discussion no agreement was reached with respect to claim allowance, but the Examiner agreed that the prior art does not seem to teach a peripheral device which is unattached to the headrest. The Examiner also pointed out that "said headrest" and "said removable headrest" were improperly used interchangeably and suggested correction.

The Final Office Action mailed November 21, 2007, has been carefully considered. After such consideration, independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 have been amended to unambiguously distinguish the present invention over the prior art of record. As such, Claims 1-9 and 11-14; 15-19; and 20-27 and 29-36 remain in the case with none of the claims currently being allowed.

Independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 were rejected under §103(a) as obvious under the combination of Jost and Merritt. In response, these claims have been amended to specify the peripheral device as being unattached to the headrest. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment patentably differentiates the present inventions over the prior art wherein the peripheral device station is attached to the headrest.

The originally filed specification clearly establishes that the peripheral device station is used by removing the detachable headrest and fitting the peripheral device into the receptacles of the seat from which the headrest was removed.¹ Since the peripheral device is attached using the receptacles vacated by the removed headrest, the peripheral device and headrest are clearly separated by space. Accordingly, the headrest and peripheral device are not attached in any manner.

Independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 were also amended to remedy the "said headrest" and "said removable headrest" inconsistency pointed out by the Examiner.

¹ "In operation of the preferred embodiment the detachable headrest is removed from the top of the passenger vehicle seat and stored in another location such as the trunk of the vehicle. The mounting posts of the adaptor are extended downwardly from the support surface. The mounting posts are then pushed into the mounting rod receptacles of the passenger vehicle seat until the support surface rests against the top of the vehicle seat. Next, the printer is attached to the support surface and secured as disclosed above." (Page 6, lines 19-24).

In light of the patentability of independent Claims 1; 15; and 20 as discussed above, dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-13; 16-19; and 21-27, 29-31 and 33-36 are likewise believed patentable over the combination of Jost and Merritt under S103(a). Furthermore, the rejection of dependent Claims 14 and 32 under the §103(a) combination of Jost, Merritt and Brooks also is deemed moot in light of the patentability of the independent Claims 1 and 20, from which the claims at issue respectively depend.

The Applicants submit that by this amendment, it has placed the case in condition for immediate allowance and such action is respectfully requested. However, if any issue remains unresolved, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity for a telephone interview to expedite allowance and issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward W. Rilee
Registration No. 31,869
MacCord Mason PLLC
Post Office Box 2974
Greensboro, NC 27402
(336) 273-4422

Date: January 16, 2008
File No.: 8534-001